

## AN OVERVIEW OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESTORATIVE JUSTICE, SUSTAINABILITY, AND SHARED KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION

## PANORAMA DA RELAÇÃO ENTRE JUSTIÇA RESTAURATIVA, SUSTENTABILIDADE E A PRODUÇÃO PARTILHADA DO CONHECIMENTO

## PANORAMA DE LA RELACIÓN ENTRE JUSTICIA RESTAURATIVA, SOSTENIBILIDAD Y LA PRODUCCIÓN COMPARTIDA DEL CONOCIMIENTO



<https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2026.008-009>

**Carla Boin<sup>1</sup>, Sérgio Bairon<sup>2</sup>**

### ABSTRACT

This article investigates the convergences and divergences between Restorative Justice and Sustainability, innovative paradigms for contemporary challenges, enhanced by mediation (Boin, 2019a) and Shared Knowledge Production (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013). Restorative Justice, focused on repair and reconciliation through mediated dialogue (Zehr, 2002; Braithwaite, 2002), contrasts with Sustainability, which aims for intergenerational balance (WCED, 1987) and respect for planetary boundaries (Rockström et al., 2009). Both share repair, systemic vision, and community participation. Mediation, as a conflict facilitation tool (Boin, 2019a), and Shared Knowledge Production, co-creating knowledge (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013), strengthen their integration in socio-environmental conflicts, education, and governance, especially from the perspective of environmental justice (Acselrad, 2009) and the epistemologies of the south (Santos, 2007). Despite resistances, cases like New Zealand and Indigenous productions offer ethical and practical solutions to global crises.

**Keywords:** Community Participation. Intergenerational Ethics. Reparation. Reconciliation. Restorative Justice. Shared Knowledge Production. Socio-environmental Conflicts. Sustainability. Systemic Vision.

### RESUMO

O artigo explora as convergências e divergências entre Justiça Restaurativa e Sustentabilidade, paradigmas inovadores para desafios contemporâneos, enriquecidos pela mediação (Boin, 2019a) e pela Produção Partilhada do Conhecimento (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013). A Justiça Restaurativa, centrada na reparação e reconciliação via diálogo mediado (Zehr, 2002; Braithwaite, 2002), contrasta com a Sustentabilidade, que busca equilíbrio intergeracional (WCED, 1987) e o respeito aos limites planetários (Rockström et al., 2009). Ambas compartilham reparação, visão sistêmica e participação comunitária. A mediação, como ferramenta facilitadora de conflitos (Boin, 2019a), e a Produção Partilhada, que co-cria saberes (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013), potencializam sua integração em conflitos socioambientais, educação e governança, especialmente sob a ótica da justiça ambiental (Acselrad, 2009) e das epistemologias do sul (Santos, 2007). Apesar de resistências,

<sup>1</sup> Postdoctoral researcher. Universidade de São Paulo (USP). E-mail: carla@boin.adv.br

<sup>2</sup> Professor. Universidade de São Paulo (USP). E-mail: bairon@usp.br

exemplos como Nova Zelândia e produções indígenas mostram soluções éticas e práticas para crises globais.

**Palavras-chave:** Conflitos Socioambientais. Ética Intergeracional. Justiça Restaurativa. Produção Partilhada do Conhecimento. Reparação. Reconciliação. Sustentabilidade. Visão Sistêmica.

## RESUMEN

El artículo explora las convergencias y divergencias entre la Justicia Restaurativa y la Sostenibilidad, paradigmas innovadores para desafíos contemporáneos, enriquecidos por la mediación (Boin, 2019a) y por la Producción Compartida del Conocimiento (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013). La Justicia Restaurativa, centrada en la reparación y reconciliación mediante el diálogo mediado (Zehr, 2002; Braithwaite, 2002), contrasta con la Sostenibilidad, que busca un equilibrio intergeneracional (WCED, 1987) y el respeto a los límites planetarios (Rockström et al., 2009). Ambas comparten elementos como la reparación, la visión sistémica y la participación comunitaria. La mediación, como herramienta facilitadora de conflictos (Boin, 2019a), y la Producción Compartida, que co-crea conocimientos (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013), potencian su integración en conflictos socioambientales, educación y gobernanza, especialmente desde la óptica de la justicia ambiental (Acselrad, 2009) y de las epistemologías del sur (Santos, 2007). A pesar de resistencias, ejemplos como Nueva Zelanda y producciones indígenas muestran soluciones éticas y prácticas frente a crisis globales.

**Palabras clave:** Conflictos Socioambientales. Ética Intergeneracional. Justicia Restaurativa. Participación Comunitaria. Producción Compartida del Conocimiento. Reparación. Reconciliación. Sostenibilidad. Visión Sistémica.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Contemporary challenges, such as inequality, climate change, and environmental degradation, demand alternative approaches. Restorative Justice, emphasizing reparation and reconciliation (Zehr, 2002), and Sustainability, promoting ethical balance for future generations (WCED, 1987), emerge as complementary paradigms. This article expands this analysis to integrate media, as highlighted by Boin (2019a), which facilitates dialogue between parties in conflict, and the Shared Production of Knowledge (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013), which co-creates knowledge via digital media. These approaches, exemplified in indigenous practices (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013) and mediated processes (Boin, 2019b), offer an ethical and practical basis to face global crises, promoting a more just and sustainable future.

On the one hand, Restorative Justice proposes an alternative to the conventional punitive system, focusing on reparation of damages, reconciliation between the parties and not strengthening social relations (Zehr, 2002). On the other hand, Sustainability seeks to harmonize human needs with the preservation of the environment, promoting an ethical and practical balance for future generations (WCED, 1987). Although they operate in different spheres — the first legal and social field, the second in the ecological, economic and social dimensions — both share fundamental values such as harmony, systemic vision, collective responsibility and a commitment to the long term. This article offers a detailed comparative analysis of these concepts, exploring their convergences, divergences and possibilities of synergistic integration. In addition, it seeks to respond to how these approaches can be intertwined to face global crises such as social inequality, climate changes and environmental degradation, contributing to a more just, balanced and resilient future.

Restorative Justice is a paradigm of dispute resolution that rejects the exclusively punitive focus of the traditional retributive system, proposing an approach focused on the reparation and reconstruction of human relationships. Differently from the logic of state punishment, which often perpetuates cycles of exclusion and violence, it emphasizes the dialogue between what is caused or harmed, what is caused or damage and the community, as a path to responsibility and cure (Zehr, 2002; Johnstone, 2011). Howard Zehr, one of the leading theorists in the field, synthesizes his essence in three northern questions: "Who was harmed? What are your needs? Who has the obligation to attend to them?" (Zehr, 2002, p. 21). This model humanizes the judicial process by prioritizing empathy and the active participation of the parties involved, promoting the restoration of social ties instead of just sanctioning or transgressor (Van Ness & Strong, 2014). In addition, Restorative Justice values personal narratives and cultural contexts, recognizing that the damage is not just a

legal violation, but a rupture in human connections (Pranis, 2005). Practical examples, such as peace circles and restorative conferences, demonstrate their effectiveness in diverse contexts, from community disputes to youth systems.

Restorative Justice rejects pure punishment, focusing on repairing and rebuilding relationships (Zehr, 2002). Boin (2019a), highlights mediation as essential iron, structuring or dialogue, we insist, between those who suffered the damage, those who caused the damage and the community to attend to the needs of all (Zehr, 2002, p. 21). This process, humanized by empathy (Pranis, 2005), gains strength with Shared Production, allowing communities to co-produce solutions (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013).

Sustainability, for the same time, is a multidimensional concept that aims to ensure the continuity of two natural and human systems, guaranteeing that the planet remains habitable and equitable for future generations. Popularized by the Brundtland Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED, 1987), this paradigm is based on three interdependent pillars: environmental (preservation of ecosystems), economic (prosperity of predatory exploration) and social (justice and inclusion) (Elkington, 1997). Ignacy Sachs (2008) expands this vision for an intergenerational ethics that rejects practices of short term, as the unfreded extractivism, in favor of strategies that respect the biophysical limits of the planet and promote collective well-being. Sustainability goes to the end of environmental conservation; it requires a cultural and structural transformation that reorients the productive systems and the ways of life that are resilient and equitable (Rockström et al., 2009). Thus, it is both an objective and a continuous process of adaptation to global dynamics, such as climatic changes and biodiversity losses. Such principles are absolutely shared by the proposals of Shared Production (Bairon, 2010), which integrates local knowledge, in terms of mediation (Boin, 2019b) facilitating sustained agreements between conflicting parties.

## 2 THE METHODOLOGICAL BRIDGE: MEDIATION AND SHARED PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE

Restorative Justice and Sustainability represent the pillars of the Concept, Mediation, and Partial Knowledge Production (PPC) emerge as the methodological approach that makes its integration viable. Far from being mere complements, they are the paths that translate theory into praxis.

Mediation, as detailed by Boin (2019a), is more than a simple negotiation. It is a structured and voluntary process, conducted by an impartial third party, which facilitates communication between the parties in conflict. Its goal is not to impose a solution, but to

create a safe environment where parties can express their needs, understand each other's perspectives, and together build consensual solutions. In the context of Restorative Justice, mediation is the tool that operationalizes the reparative dialogue. In socio-environmental conflicts, it becomes crucial to balance seemingly antagonistic interests — such as those of a community and industry — transforming an adversarial dispute into a collaborative process of seeking a sustainable future for all.

The Shared Production of Knowledge, for the same time, is a research methodology that challenges the traditional hierarchy between academic knowledge and community knowledge (Bairon, 2010). Using multiple image and sound technologies, such as video and digital platforms, PPC allows communities themselves to become producers of knowledge about their reality, their memories and their aspirations (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013). As seen in the work of indigenous filmmakers such as Divino Tserewahú, this approach hardly documents, but strengthens cultural identity and political autonomy. Restorative Justice has gained a powerful structure for the symbolic reparation of historical damages, as for Sustainability, it is enriched with local knowledge for the construction of ecologically adapted and socially just solutions, in line with the Epistemologies of the South of Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2007).

Together, Mediation and PPC form a virtuous cycle: PPC interacts and prioritizes the knowledge of communities, and Restorative Justice - Mediation structures the dialogue so that these community voices are valued and can negotiate fair and sustainable.

### 3 SHARED PRINCIPLES

#### 3.1 FOCUS ON REPARATION AND RECONCILIATION

Both Restorative Justice and Sustainability have the idea of reparation at their core. In Restorative Justice, the focus is on repairing the damage caused and on reconciling the parts involved, transforming the conflict in an opportunity to learn and grow (Marshall, 1999). This process hardly restores the broken balance, but it also strengthens social cohesion to enhance the narratives of all affected (Zehr, 2002). In Sustainability, reparation is turned to degraded ecosystems — such as the reforestation of deforested areas or the recovery of polluted rivers — seeking to reconcile humanity and nature (Daly & Farley, 2011). Such actions repair the pasture while building a sustainable future, a direct echo of the restorative principle of transforming us into opportunities (Sachs.2008). Convergence that shows a common ethics of healing, whether in interpersonal relationships or in the relationship with the planet.

### 3.2 SYSTEMIC VISION

Both paradigms adopt a holistic perspective that transcends fragmented solutions. Restorative Justice sees harm as an event embedded in a web of social relations, whose causes and consequences reverberate beyond the isolated act (Van Ness & Strong, 2014). This systemic approach is similar to that of Sustainability, which recognizes the interconnectedness between environmental, social, and economic factors (Elkington, 1997). Understanding these interdependent networks is essential for addressing complex problems such as ecological damage (Fritjof Capra, 1996). For example, the policy of a river is not just an environmental issue, but also social (dislocation of communities) and economic (loss of resources), demanding solutions that consider all these dimensions — a logic aligned with Restorative Justice when dealing with the roots of conflicts.

### 3.3 COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

The centrality of the community is another point of convergence. In Restorative Justice, the community plays an active role in supporting people who suffer damage, facilitate dialogue and reintegrate people who cause damage, promoting a sense of belonging and collective responsibility (Marshall, 1999; Pranis, 2005). In Sustainability, local communities are protagonists in the management of natural resources, as well as in community conservation initiatives or regenerative agriculture (Ostrom, 1990). Collaborative governance of commons can be more effective than top-down policies, a principle that resonates with the restorative emphasis on cooperation (Elinor Ostrom, 1990). It is precisely this valorization of the collective that underlines the idea that long-lasting solutions depend on the active participation and strengthening of social networks, to repair a damage, to preserve an ecosystem.

## 4 DIFFERENCES OF SCOPPO AND APPLICATION

### 4.1 TEMPORAL SCOPUS

A striking difference between the two paradigms lies in the time horizon. Restorative Justice operates predominantly in the course and through practice, focusing on the resolution of specific conflicts and the immediate reparation of damages (Zehr, 2002). This objective is the cure and reconciliation not present, as in cases of community mediation. Sustainability, on the other hand, is projected for the long term, concerned with the intergenerational impacts of current actions, such as carbon emissions or soil erosion (WCED, 1987). This future vision requires non-present sacrifices to guarantee the viability of the planet, contrasting with the restorative urgency of resolving immediate disputes (Daly & Farley, 2011).

## 4.2 PRIMARY FOCUS

The primary focus also diverges. On the one hand, Restorative Justice is essentially anthropocentric, dealing with human emotions such as guilt, loss and empathy, and seeking to restore interpersonal relationships (Marshall, 1999). On the other hand, Sustainability adopts a balanced ecological approach, prioritizing interdependence between humans and ecosystems (Sachs, 2008). While Zehr (2002) emphasizes the construction of bridges between individuals, Capra (1996) and Naess (1989) defend an ecological ethics that transcends the human, recognizing nature as a final in itself. This difference reflects distinct priorities: social harmony versus planetary harmony.

## 4.3 METHODS AND TOOLS: FROM MICRO TO MACRO

The clearest distinction between the two fields is distinguished in their methods and offered paths, which operate on different but complementary scales. Restorative Justice acts at the micro level, using qualitative and relational tools. These main instruments are dialogue circles, restorative conferencies, and mediation between those who cause harm and those who cause damage (Van Ness & Strong, 2014; Pranis, 2005). These practices are dialogue-intensive, focused on active listening, empathy, and consensus-building processes. The success is measured by the satisfaction of the parties, by the reparation of the perceived damage and by the restoration of the community areas, results that are eminently qualitative.

Sustentabilidade, now operates predominantly at the macro and structural level, undertaking quantitative and large-scale research. Its proposals include public policies (such as global climate agreements or environmental protection legislation), green technologies (renewable energy, circular economy) and impact indicators (carbon gluing, planetary boundaries) (Elkington, 1997; Rockström et al., 2009). The objective is to promote systemic changes that alter production and consumption patterns. Success is often mediated by quantifiable goals, such as reducing greenhouse gas emissions or preserving hectares of forest.

This disparity, however, opens up a vast field for synergy. The micro approaches of Restorative Justice can be used to build the social consensus necessary for the implementation of macro Sustainability policies. For example, a restorative dialogue process can resolve a local conflict over the installation of a wind farm, ensuring that the energy transition (macro) is socially just (micro). In other words, Sustainability technologies can expand the reach of restorative practices, such as the use of digital platforms to connect distant communities in dialogues about climate justice.

## 5 PRACTICAL INTERSECTIONS

### 5.1 SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICTS

Socio-environmental conflicts, such as disputes over land in the Amazon or industrial policy in vulnerable communities, are fertile ground for practical integration. Restorative Justice dialogues with tensions between indigenous communities and companies or governments, repairing social damage and promoting collaborative agreements (Marshall, 1999). At the same time, Sustainability offers strategies to protect the ecosystems involved, such as the creation of conservation areas or the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices (Ostrom, 1990). A combination that can align social and environmental justice, especially in regions where predatory exploration exacerbates inequalities (Sachs, 2008).

The indigenous productions "Tsō'rehipări", directed by Xavante filmmaker Divino Tserewahú, and "Boé Eru Kurireu", made by Paulinho Ecerae Kadojeba with Tserewahú's montage, exemplify in a powerful way the intersection between Restorative Justice and Sustainability, potentiated by the mediation and the Partial Production of Knowledge (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013). "Tsō'rehipări" traces the history of the songs of the Salesian mission of Sangradouro, using reflexivity to dialogue with the community and against external narratives, such as Genil Vasconcelos' 1949 film (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013). This process reflects the restorative principles of reparation and reconciliation, valuing the narratives of the elders and the community to retell their own history, promoting collective healing through historical traumas (Zehr, 2002). In the middle of the context, Tserewahú's method is implicit, which submits the film to community approval, guaranteeing that everyone's needs are attended to (Boin, 2019a).

On the other hand, "Boé Eru Kurireu" presents the bororo funeral ritual from the perspective of who lives in culture, criticizing external representations such as the Fantástico da Rede Globo program (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013). The collaboration between Paulinho, um bororo, and Divino, um xavante — historically rivals ethnic groups —, exemplifies Shared Production of Knowledge by creating an intercultural bridge that promotes mutual understanding and the appreciation of traditions. This dialogue between different forms of knowledge is fundamental for Sustainability, which depends on cultural diversity to find resilient solutions (Sachs, 2008). Both films will use audiovisual language to strengthen the identity and autonomy of their communities, demonstrate how symbolic reparation (Restorative Justice) and cultural preservation (Sustainability) are intrinsically linked.

## 5.2 EDUCATION FOR PEACE AND SUSTAINABILITY

Education is a promising field for the integration of these paradigms. Programs that combine education for peace, based on restorative principles, with education for sustainability can form more conscious and engaged citizens (Senge, 2006). Schools that adopt dialogue circles to resolve conflicts and, at the same time, implement community projects or recycling, teach in practice the interconnection between social and environmental well-being. This holistic approach prepares young people to deal with the complexity of two global challenges, promoting a culture of peace and ecological responsibility (Capra, 1996).

## 5.3 COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE

The governance of natural resources and urban spaces can benefit from the fusion of these paradigms. Restorative Justice offers models of participatory decision-making, such as sentencing circles, which can be adapted for the management of common blessings (Ostrom, 1990). For example, in a dispute over the use of water in a hydrographic basin, a restorative process could bring together farmers, industries and riverside communities to build a sustainable management plan that meets the needs of all and guarantees the health of the ecosystem. This collaborative approach, which values dialogue and the cooking of solutions, is more resilient and legitimate than unilaterally imposed policies (Van Ness & Strong, 2014).

# 6 CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS: NAVIGATING COMPLEX WATERS

Despite the potential synergistic, the integration of Restorative Justice with Sustainability is not a path of obstacles. On the contrary, it faces structural, cultural and scale challenges that need to be carefully navigated.

The first and most radical challenge is institutional inertia. Hegemonic legal and economic systems, deeply rooted in the retributive paradigm and not unlimited growth, offer forte resistance. The punitive logic of traditional penal law and the incessant search for profit is fundamentally based on the values of reparation, dialogue and intergenerational care (Johnstone, 2011). Integration, in this context, runs the risk of superficial co-optation, where restorative practices are adopted as a veneer of legitimacy without the underlying power structures being altered.

The second challenge is the issue of scalability. Restorative Justice, with its intensive methods in dialogue and focused on the local context, finds it difficult to be applied to global and systemic problems, such as climate crisis or large-scale biodiversity loss (Rockström et al., 2009). How to escalate a dialogue circle to mediate the conflict between nations over

carbon emission targets? The transposition of micro methods to the macro level is not straightforward and requires significant methodological and institutional innovations.

Finally, there is the risk of depoliticization. Focusing on harmony and interpersonal reconciliation, restorative practices, if misapplied, can inadvertently mask the deep asymmetries of power that are at the root of many socio-environmental conflicts. In a dispute between an indigenous community and a multinational mining company, a dialogue that does not recognize this disparity of power can end up legitimizing injustice, instead of fighting it. Environmental Justice, as formulated by Acselrad (2009), alerts us to the importance of maintaining a critical lens on the political and economic dimensions of conflicts, preventing the search for consensus from overcoming the fight for justice.

Overcoming these barriers requires more than goodwill; It requires a profound cultural transformation that values interdependence and collective responsibility (Senge, 2006), as well as the creation of new institutional arranjos that are flexible, polycentric and capable of articulating local and global scales.

## 7 CASE STUDY: AOTEAROA (NEW ZEALAND) AND PLURIVERSAL GOVERNANCE

Aotearoa, the Māori name for New Zealand, offers two most advanced and inspiring examples of how the integration between justice, sustainability and indigenous knowledge can be institutionalized. The country was not just a pioneer in the adoption of Restorative Justice in the youth system, but it was also innovative to incorporate Māori cosmology in its legal structure and environmental governance.

The pillar of integration is the Treaty of Waitangi (1840), which established a partnership between the British Commonwealth and the Māori. Although historically neglected, the treaty has been progressively reinterpreted as a basis for governance that recognizes indigenous sovereignty and rights. This manifests itself in concepts such as "Kaitiakitanga", which can be translated as an ethics of guardianship or guardianship, where humans have the responsibility to protect and care for the natural world (the *taonga*, or *tesouro*).

The most radical example of this approach is the Te Urewera Act (2014), a law that granted legal personality to the ancient Te Urewera National Park, a vast area of forest ancestral to the Tūhoe people. The law declares that Te Urewera is "no longer the property of the Crown, nor of anyone," but a living entity in itself, with "rights, powers, duties, and responsibilities." A governing board, composed by Tūhoe and Chorus representatives, was raised to act as guardian and "speak on behalf" of Te Urewera. This legal innovation

represents a radical departure from the Western view of nature as a resource to be exploited, aligning itself with a Māori relational ontology.

This approach can be seen as a practical manifestation of the "pluriverse" advocated by Arturo Escobar (2018) — the construction of a world where multiple worlds (or ontologies) can coexist, a principle fully consistent with Restorative Justice. Instead of imposing a single model of conservation, New Zealand is trying to create a legal system that accommodates different ways of life and relates to the non-human. Restorative processes are often used to resolve disputes over resources, not only to mediate interests, but to redress historical damages and build a shared future. Although does not follow a model of tensions and contradictions, the case of Aotearoa demonstrates that it is possible to achieve social justice, historical reconciliation and ecological sustainability in a collaborative governance quadro (Marshall, 1999).

## 8 CASE STUDY: THE COMMISSION OF TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION OF SOUTH AFRICA

The Commission of Truth and Reconciliation (CVR) of South Africa, led by Archbishop Desmond Tutu (1999), is an emblematic example of Restorative Justice on a large scale. Although its main focus on the reparation of apartheid traumas, its principles of dialogue, truth and reconciliation created a propitious environment for the construction of a more just society and, consequently, more sustainable. The CVR did not limit itself to investigating who caused the damage and who suffered the damage; It sought to restore the dignity of the people who suffered damage and reintegrate the people who caused damage to the community, strengthening the social situation of the country (Tutu, 1999).

As for CVR addressing the damage of the past in the last year and in the middle of the process, sustainability in Africa of South Africa has been strengthened through community initiatives that allow for the balance of human needs with environmental preservation in the long period (WCED, 1987). Projects such as sustainable community agriculture and reforestation programs in rural areas, often led by local cooperatives, express this commitment (Sachs, 2008). These actions do not barely combat environmental degradation, but they also address socio-economic inequalities inherited from apartheid, aligning with the pillars of sustainability — environmental, economic and social — proposed by Elkington (1997). Mediated reconciliation created the social conditions necessary for these initiatives to flourish, demonstrating how community stability is a foundation for sustainability.

Community participation is a key driver that unites these two paradigms in South Africa (Ostrom, 1990; Pranis, 2005). The CVR broadly involved the population, with public hearings

and deposits that strengthened the sense of collective responsibility (Tutu, 1999), a principle that echoes in restorative practices (Boin, 2019b). In the same way, community sustainability projects depend on local collaboration, such as urban gardens and cooperatives that promote food security and income management in marginalized areas (Sachs, 2008). This synergia reflects a systemic vision (Capra, 1996), where the reparation of human relationships, facilitated by restorative dialogue, supports efforts to build resilient economic and environmental systems, benefiting both current and future generations.

The Su-African case represents a profound synergistic potential: Restorative Justice, by means of mediated reconciliation, repairs the traumas of the past (Van Ness & Strong, 2014), in terms of Community Sustainability assures a future journey (Boin, 2019b). The CVR hardly promotes social peace, but it also opened the way for communities, now more cohesive, to engage in sustainable practices that combat poverty and environmental degradation. Although the Shared Production of Knowledge (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013) does not have an explicit component in this example, the use of media platforms to disseminate the stories of the CVR suggests fertile ground for participatory technologies that can amplify this synergy, connecting local experiences to global solutions and strengthening integration between these paradigms (Boin, 2019a).

## 9 ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS: TOWARDS RADICAL RESPONSIBILITY

The integration of Restorative Justice and Sustainability is not just a question of efficiency, but a profound ethical reorientation. It invites us to transcend the traditional borders and to adopt what could be called a radical responsibility ethic (Boin, 2019b).

Restorative Justice, at its core, challenges the retributive ethic of punishment with an ethic of compassion and mutual responsibility. It tells us that we are related beings and that the damage to a member gives community to all (Zehr, 2002). Sustainability, for the same time, confronts the extractive and consumerist ethics with the ethics of care and intergenerational responsibility. It summons us to consider the impact of our *ações* on future generations and on the life that sustains us (WCED, 1987).

When fused, these two ethics give rise to something greater: an expanded vision of justice that dissolves the dichotomy between the human and the nonhuman. Inspired by Arne Naess's deep ecology (1989), Fritjof Capra's systemic vision (1996) and by the concept of Restorative Justice as addressed by Carla Boin (2019b), these approaches recognize that social justice and environmental justice are separate. It is no longer just about justice *between* humans, but about justice *for how* the living system of which we are a part. This perspective

echoes Bruno Latour's (2018) call to "ground" and acknowledge our deep dependence and entanglement with the Earth, surpassing the modern separation between Nature and Society.

This raises complex and urgent ethical questions: who speaks on behalf of rivers, forests and species in a circle of restorative dialogue? How can we repair damages caused to non-human entities and to generations that are still not born? The answer may lie in the construction of interspecies justice, an emerging field that seeks to give voice and legal representation to non-humans, as seen in the case of New Zealand. To adopt this ethic of radical responsibility means to recognize that the cure of human relationships and the cure of the planet are not separate tasks, but a single and same day.

## 10 FUTURE PERSPECTIVES: HORIZONS FOR AN INTEGRATED PRAXIS

Looking to the future of the integration between Restorative Justice and Sustainability is to envision the emergence of new forms of governance, technology and culture. It is not a matter of predicting a destination, but of mapping the horizons that open up from this synergy.

In the technological field, the challenge is to go further from the instrumental vision. Instead of just using artificial intelligence to monitor environmental damage (Daly & Farley, 2011), the question is how we can use digital technologies to build a true "ecology of knowledges" (Santos, 2007). The hypermedia platforms, focused on the Partial Production of Knowledge (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013), can be developed not to extract dice, but to connect communities, facilitate intercultural dialogues and allow local and scientific knowledge to co-create solutions, avoiding the risk of a new digital colonialism.

In the field of governance, integration points to models that overcome state centralization (In the field of governance, integration points to models that overcome state centralization). The ideology of a "polycentric restorative governance", inspired by Elinor Ostrom's work (1990), emerges as a promising possibility. This model, multiple decision-making centers (local communities, municipalities, civil society organizations, global networks) are articulated in a flexible and adaptive way, using restorative principles to manage the common good, from a local hydrographic basin to the global atmosphere.

Finally, in the cultural and economic field, the integration of these paradigms can find an operational model in Kate Raworth's "Donut Economy" (2017). This model visualizes an economy that operates within a safe and just space: an ecological "teto", defined by planetary boundaries (Rockström et al., 2009), and a social "alicerce", which guarantees that basic human needs are met. Restorative Justice can provide the social processes to negotiate how to live within that foundation, while Sustainability sets the limits of the ceiling. Integration, therefore, is not just an ideal, but a project that demands a profound cultural transformation.

in the direction of a systemic and collaborative mentality (Senge, 2006), a horizon that guides us in the construction of a more just and lasting future.

## 11 CONCLUSION

This article shows that Restorative Justice and Sustainability are different in their foci and methods, but they are not very compatible, but profoundly synergistic. The analysis revealed that its shared principles — repair, systemic vision and community participation — forms a robust base to face the complex and interconnected challenges of the XXI series. Restorative Justice, with its emphasis on healing human relationships (Boin, 2019b)), creates the social capital necessary for Sustainability to flourish. For the same time, Sustainability, to project an equitable and resilient future (WCED, 1987), offers a major purpose for social reconciliation.

The introduction of mediation (Boin, 2019a) and Shared Production of Knowledge (Bairon & Lazaneo, 2013) acts as a catalyst, transforming this theoretical synergy into praxis. In the middle of the journey, we offer the paths to navigate the socio-environmental conflicts, as for Produção Partilhada guarantor that the solutions are co-created with the affected communities, respecting and integrating their knowledge, in line with the Epistemologies of Sul (Santos, 2007). The examples of Nova Zealand, South Africa and indigenous audiovisual productions illustrate that this integration is not utopian, but a reality in construction.

However, overcoming institutional resistance and promoting a cultural mutancy that embraces complexity (Senge, 2006) and interdependence (Latour, 2018) are crucial. The way forward is not to choose between repairing people or repairing the planet, but to recognize that they are two faces of the same structure. True sustainability can only be achieved in a socially just world, and full justice will only be possible on an ecologically balanced planet. The use of these paradigms, therefore, is not just an academic purpose, but an ethical and practical imperative for the construction of a future in which human dignity and planetary integrity coexist.

## REFERENCES

Acselrad, H. (2009). *O que é justiça ambiental*. Garamond.

Bairon, S. (2010). *Antropologia visual e hipermídia*. In J. da Silva Ribeiro & S. Bairon (Orgs.), *Antropologia visual e hipermídia*. Edições Afrontamento.

Bairon, S., & Lazaneo, C. de S. (2013). *Produção partilhada do conhecimento: Do filme à hipermídia*. In J. da Silva Ribeiro & S. Bairon (Orgs.), *Antropologia visual e hipermídia*. Edições Afrontamento.

Boin, C. Z. (2019a). Mediação e justiça restaurativa: A humanização do sistema processual como forma de realização dos princípios constitucionais. *Quartier Latin*.

Boin, C. M. Z. (2019b). Justiça restaurativa no contexto universitário: Caso da Universidade Dalhousie Canadá (Tese de doutorado). Universidade de São Paulo.

Braithwaite, J. (2002). Restorative justice and responsive regulation. Oxford University Press.

Capra, F. (1996). *The web of life: A new scientific understanding of living systems*. Anchor Books.

Daly, H. E., & Farley, J. (2011). *Ecological economics: Principles and applications* (2nd ed.). Island Press.

Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Capstone Publishing.

Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds*. Duke University Press.

Johnstone, G. (2011). *Restorative justice: Ideas, values, debates* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Latour, B. (2018). *Down to earth: Politics in the new climatic regime*. Polity Press.

Marshall, T. F. (1999). Restorative justice: An overview. Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate.

Naess, A. (1989). *Ecology, community and lifestyle: Outline of an ecosophy*. Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.

Pranis, K. (2005). *The little book of circle processes: A new/old approach to peacemaking*. Good Books.

Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., III, Lambin, E., Lenton, T. M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H. J., Nykvist, B., de Wit, C. A., Hughes, T., van der Leeuw, S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin, S., Snyder, P. K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., Falkenmark, M., Karlberg, L., Corell, R. W., Fabry, V. J., Hansen, J., Walker, B., Liverman, D., Richardson, K., Crutzen, P., & Foley, J. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature*, 461(7263), 472–475.

Sachs, I. (2008). *Desenvolvimento sustentável e a nova ordem internacional*. Saraiva.

Santos, B. de S. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges. *Review*, 30(1), 1–66.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Currency/Doubleday.

Tutu, D. (1999). *No future without forgiveness*. Doubleday.

Van Ness, D. W., & Strong, K. H. (2014). *Restoring justice: An introduction to restorative justice* (5th ed.). Routledge.

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.

Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Good Books.